

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified patent application containing Figures 2-6 is being presented as a new drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing Figure 6 has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

The specific changes which have been made to Figure 6 is marking the additional basepans 20 with the element number "20".

## REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 13, 26 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-31 (31 claims) are now pending in this application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner states that the additional base pan as claimed in claim 25 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. In response, the Applicants submit that Fig. 6 illustrates the embodiment including four basepans. However, as originally filed, the original basepans were not identified with an element number "20". The Applicants have amended Fig. 6 by including element number "20" and arrows indicating additional basepans as shown in the attached amended drawing sheet with the additional numerals marked in red. Fig. 6, as originally filed, clearly shows lines separating the various basepans. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been entered. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

On page 3, paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570).

Claim 1 is in independent form. Independent claim 1 (as amended) now recites "a second bus bar mounted on a side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall and aligned 90° from the first bus bar".

A basepan assembly in which a second bus bar is mounted “on a side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall and aligned 90° from the first bus bar” as required by independent claim 1 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Buchanan. The orientation of the second bus bar and the mounting of the second bus bar on a narrow edge side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall of the basepan is not taught or suggested by Buchanan as disclosed in paragraphs 0008 and 0015 and at least Figs. 1 and 7 of the present application and as claimed.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent claim 1 (as amended) and dependent claims 2-12 as they depend from independent claim 1.

Claim 13 is in independent form. Independent claim 13 (as amended) now recites “a second bus bar mounted on a side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall and aligned 90° from the first bus bar”.

A basepan assembly in which a second bus bar is mounted “on a side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall and aligned 90° from the first bus bar” as required by independent claim 13 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Buchanan. The orientation of the second bus bar and the mounting of the second bus bar on a narrow edge side portion of the bus bar proximate the sidewall of the basepan is not taught or suggested by Buchanan as disclosed in paragraphs 0008 and 0015 and at least Figs. 1 and 7 of the present application and as claimed.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent claim 13 (as amended) and dependent claims 14-25 as they depend from independent claim 13.

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 2, 7, 8, 11, 14, 19, 20, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570).

Dependent claims 2, 7, 8, and 11 depend from independent claim 1 (as amended). Dependent claims 14, 19, 20, 23 and 25 depend from independent claim 13 (as amended). As previously described, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to recite a combination of subject matter that the Applicants believe to be allowable. The Applicants' comments with regard to Buchanan are applicable here also.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and dependent claims 2, 7, 8, 11, 14, 19, 20, 23, and 25 as they depend from either independent claim 1 (as amended) or independent claim 13 (as amended) are now allowable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112, par. 4. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the cited claims.

On pages 5-6, paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570) as applied to the claims above in view of Barner (USPN: 4,740,865).

Dependent claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 (as amended). Dependent claim 17, depends from independent claim 13 (as amended). As previously discussed, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to recite a combination of subject matter the Applicants believe to be allowable. The Applicants' comments with regard to Buchanan are applicable here also.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and dependent claim 5 as it depends from independent claim 1 (as amended) and dependent claim 17 as it depends from independent claim 13 (as amended), are now allowable. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 5 and 17.

On page 6, paragraph 6, of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570) as applied to the claims above and in view of M'Sadotues, et al (USPN: 4,546,200).

Dependent claims 9 and 10 depend from independent claim 1 (as amended). Dependent claims 21 and 22 depend from independent claim 13 (as amended). As previously described, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to recite a combination of subject matter the Applicants believe to be allowable. The Applicants' comments with regard to Buchanan are applicable here also.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and dependent claims 9 and 10 as they depend from independent claim 1 (as amended) and dependent claims 21 and 22 as they depend from independent claim 13 (as amended), are now allowable. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 9, 10, 21, and 22.

On pages 7 and 8, paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570) in view of Hancock, et al (USPN: 4,916,574). Claim 26 is in independent form. Independent claim 26 (as amended) now recites a method for mounting a bus bar which includes steps of installing the bus bar bottom edge in a groove and coupling the "top edge of the bus bar" to the sidewall with a fastener.

The combination of prior art suggested by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest what is required by independent claim 26 (as amended). Specifically, Hancock does not suggest or teach mounting of a bus bar on its bottom edge and coupling the top edge of the bus bar with a fastener to the sidewall of the basepan. The groove, as characterized by the Examiner in Hancock is described by Hancock as a channel that receives the wide side of a flat bus bar and not a bottom edge of a bus bar as described and claimed in the present application. See Fig. 1 of Hancock in col. 2, lines 25-30. The Applicants' comments with regard to Buchanan are applicable here also. The Applicants submit that one ordinarily skilled in the art would not be compelled to combine Hancock with Buchanan to obtain that which is disclosed and claimed in the present application.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and independent claim 26 (as amended) and dependent claims 27-30 as they depend from independent claim 26 (as amended) are now allowable. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 26-30.

On page 8, paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan (USPN: 6,459,570) in view of Hancock, et al (USPN: 4,916,574) as applied to claim 26 above and in further view of M'Sadotues, et al (USPN: 4,546,200).

Dependent claim 31 depends from independent claim 26 (as amended). As previously described, the Applicants have amended independent claim 26 to recite a combination of subject matter the Applicants believe to be allowable. Further, the Applicants' comments with regard to Hancock and Buchanan above are applicable here.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome and dependent claim 31 as it depends from independent claim 26 (as amended), is allowable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 para. 4. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claim 31.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 26, have been amended. The Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of claims 1-31.

The Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 02-15-06

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5776  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By 

James A. Wilke  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Registration No. 34,279

